



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXVIII.

SEPTEMBER, 1891.

GOLDWIN SMITH AND THE JEWS.

BY ISAAC BESHT BENDAVID.

MR. GOLDWIN SMITH is an amiable, an attractive, and, as I had always till now supposed, an accurate writer. Although he is an Englishman by birth, he does not seem to share the insular prejudices of so many of his countrymen in favor of those aristocratic institutions of which England is the most highly developed modern type.

Great, therefore, is my surprise to find Mr. Goldwin Smith arraying himself, in the cosmopolitan pages of *THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW*, with the persecutors of the Jewish race, and lending the authority of his name to the propagation of what I must ask his permission to describe as impressions at once unfair and unfounded in regard to the relations of the people of Israel with the nations of central and of eastern Europe. To do this at any time would be to serve instincts and traditions with which it should be impossible for any true liberal of the nineteenth century to sympathize. To do this at a time when every steamer which arrives from the continent of Europe brings its contingent of Jewish men, women, and children, seeking in the new world a refuge from the injustice of the old, is surely to gladden the heart of the oppressor and to darken the faces of the oppressed.

It was a beautiful thought of the great French sculptor, Bartholdi, himself a scion of the chosen people, to embody the homage

of European freedom to American institutions in a colossal image of Liberty enlightening the world ; and it was a thought not less beautiful which moved another son of Israel, himself an American citizen, to provide the means whereby this noble image has been set in the very gateway of America, there to welcome and to cheer the exiles of all lands. Certainly it is not from this radiant Pharos of hope and of progress that Mr. Goldwin Smith has derived the "new light" which he professes to shed upon the Jewish question.

I shall have no trouble, I think, to show Mr. Goldwin Smith himself, if he be, as I willingly believe him to be, a disinterested seeker after truth, that this "new light," like many other "new lights," is by no means a light from heaven, and that it has led him far astray. More than this, I shall be able to show him that it is not in any sense a "new light" at all. It is, on the contrary, an old obscuration of a very old question.

"The general belief," Mr. Goldwin Smith begins by telling us "has been that the anti-Semitic movement is religious, and that the Jews are being persecuted, as they were or are assumed to have been in the dark ages, on account of their faith." "Such was the tenor," he goes on to say, "of all the manifestoes, speeches, and editorials in which British indignation against Russia found vent after the anti-Semitic disturbances of 1880. Everybody said that the dark ages had come again, and that the murderous atrocities of mediæval fanaticism were being reënacted in the nineteenth century." Whereupon Mr. Goldwin Smith proceeds to enlighten the general mind by assuring us, in the first place, that "persecution is not the tendency of the Russian or of the church to which he belongs," and, in the next place, that the Jews are hated and assailed, not only in Russia, but in Austria, in Germany, in the Balkan states, and "even in the Ionian Islands," not because they cling to the religion in which the founder of Christianity was born and trained, but because they refuse everywhere to live the life of the country in which they dwell, or to support themselves and their families by productive industries. It is to "economical and social," not to religious, causes that he would have Americans attribute the expulsion, by popular violence or administrative tyranny, of thousands of Jewish families from their homes, the practical confiscation in many cases of all their property, and the complete uprooting in all cases of large com-

munities from the lands in which these communities have dwelt for long years, necessarily contributing to the resources and necessarily bearing their share of the burdens of the commonwealth.

These are very serious things to say. This is a very grave indictment to frame against a whole race; for no exceptions are made. Our accuser does not content himself with an attempt to exculpate the Russian authorities. He formulates his general accusation in a manner which must compel impartial and logical persons who accept his views to the conclusion that the Russian authorities deserve not blame, but praise, for their determined effort to expel the race of Israel from the dominions of the Czar. To believe this is to believe—is it not?—that all other governments ought to imitate the government of Russia. If the influence exerted by the Jews upon the economical and social life of Russia has been such as to warrant their removal *en masse* from the empire, is it tolerable that so pestiferous a population should be planted in other countries?

“The explanation of the whole trouble, and of all the calamities and horrors attending it,” we are told by Mr. Goldwin Smith, after he has cited a number of British consular reports imputing usurious and mischievous practices to the Jews in certain Russian towns, “is that the Jews are, to adopt the phrase borrowed by Vice-Consul Wagstaff from natural history, a parasitic race. Detached from their own country, they insert themselves for the purpose of gain into the homes of other nations, while they retain a marked and repellent nationality of their own.”

This is the core of the whole matter, according to our accuser. The Jews are “a parasitic race.” So convinced is Mr. Goldwin Smith of this that he goes into an elaborate argument, with which I will not just now deal further than to refer my readers to his own statement of it, in order to show that “parasitism” is inherent in the very nature of the Jew. I must do our accuser the justice to say that he grows vague and misty when confronted, by his own conscience, with the necessity of giving some plausible account of the origin of this very peculiar “parasitism” of a race which produced not only the prophets and the psalmists of Israel, but the Christian apostle upon whom we are told the world-embracing church of Christianity was founded as “upon a rock.” “Its principal cause probably,” he tells us, “was the narrowness of the Jewish territory combined with the love of gain in the

Jew." I will not stop to point out that the great Napoleon founded upon precisely similar premises his celebrated indictment of the race of which Mr. Goldwin Smith is so distinguished an ornament, as "a nation of shopkeepers." But when Mr. Goldwin Smith goes on to strike at the Jew over the back of his "near kinsman, the Phœnician"; to draw support for his imputation of "parasitism" against the Jew from a contrast between the "mercantile" colonization of the Phœnician and the "nobler colonization of the Greek"; and to aver that the parasitism of the Jews drew upon them the shafts of "the Roman satirist" long centuries ago, I cannot refrain from inviting my readers to remember that it was not a Jew at all, but a "needy Greek"—*Græculus esuriens*—of whom the "Roman satirist" alleged that his greed would make him even undertake to fly. It was not as a parasitic shopkeeper bent on usurious profits, but as a mystic believer in the ineffable truths of a lofty spiritual faith, "commercing with the skies" for God and not for gain, that the Jew—"credat Judæus Apella"—invited the polished contempt of the worldly-minded and epicurean "Roman satirist." Ought a Christian scholar of the nineteenth century to forget the homage paid by Augustus Cæsar to the spiritual faith and civic virtue of his Jewish subjects? Or is Mr. Goldwin Smith, in his zeal for the "derabbinization" of the Jews, really ready to turn into derision the heroic martyrdom of Israel under Caligula?

"The Jew is now detested," we are calmly told, "not only because he absorbs the national wealth, but because, when present in numbers, he eats out the core of nationality." If this were true, Baron Hirsch, of whose "philanthropic zeal" Mr. Goldwin Smith, in his ardent desire to see eastern Europe rid of a "parasitic race," speaks in loud words of commendation, would deserve, not commendation at all, but the sternest reprehension. How can a man be called a "philanthropist" who seeks to introduce into Australia, into America, into the Argentine Republic, and that "in numbers," a parasitic race destined and doomed by nature not only to absorb the national wealth, but to eat out the core of nationality from among whatever people may be cursed by its presence?

But this is not true.

It is precisely the contrary of this which is true. Frederick the Great was no lover of the Jews as Jews any more than of

Englishmen as Englishmen. His "general privilege" issued to the Jews of Prussia in 1750 reeks with intolerance and political bigotry. With his own hand this royal admirer of Voltaire struck out the name of Mendelssohn, which all Germany, and, indeed, all Christendom, unites to honor to-day, from the list of his great Berlin Academy. But Frederick the Great was a mighty ruler of men, and broadened the foundations upon which his descendants have built up the foremost European power of our times. And it was Frederick the Great who laid it down as an axiom that "to oppress the Jews has never brought prosperity to any government." Was this because the prince of royal sceptics believed the oppression of the Jew would be avenged by the God of Israel? Certainly not! It was because the shrewdest and most indefatigable of royal observers had learned that in every state in which they find themselves compelled to establish their homes the children of Israel, adhering to the precepts of their great lawgiver and enlightened by the wisdom (Talmudic or Karaite) of their forefathers, have always been found to be a source of strength, not of weakness. He found them everywhere not absorbing, but increasing, the "national wealth"; not "eating out the core," but building up the body, of every nationality to which they have contributed their vital force.

Had the Jews "eaten out the core" of the nationality of Spain when, twenty years after the conquest of England by William the Norman, they drove the Moors forth from "the city of generations," the Jerusalem of the West, and established the throne of Alonzo *el Emperador*? Where had been the deathless glory of the Cid, Rodrigo de Bivar, the Campeador of Spain and the bulwark of Europe, but for the Jews of Toledo? What Spaniards did Spain better service in that marvellous twelfth century than the Spanish Jews who laid the pavements of La Blanca in soil brought from Mount Zion, and who framed of cedarwood from Lebanon that lofty and noble ceiling which still delights the artist and the architect, though ages have passed since the brave and loyal heirs of the builders were hounded to destruction by the savage Vincente Ferrer, in order that the mob might pillage their homes—even as Pedro the Cruel before them had plundered the treasury of his wisest councillor and tortured to death the faithful servant he had robbed? Does not Mr. Goldwin Smith know that to this day, in Servia, in Macedonia, in

Rumania, in Bulgaria, the descendants of the exiled Jews of Spain, driven forth from the land they had done so much to redeem and to enrich, still proudly call themselves Spaniards ; still preserve the speech of Spain ; still cherish in their eastern homes the memories of a heroic past in western Europe ? Does he not know that the Hebrew newspaper which represents the ideas and the interests of the Hebrew race at Salonica bears the Spanish name of the *Epoca* ?

Nay, let me ask Mr. Goldwin Smith to look into the annals of the Hebrew race in his own country and in his own time. He will find that the Jews of England, down to the very eve of the Reform Bill, clung to the use in their religious services of the language of Spain. It was only in 1829, and after a most earnest and critical debate, that the loyalty of the Hebrew exiles to the language of Samuel Levi and of Benjamin of Tudela could be shaken by the persistent efforts of men like Moses Montefiore and N. M. de Rothschild, who were anxious to see English patriotism encouraged among the Hebrew residents of England by a complete identification of the Jew, in all his social and political rights, with the Protestant and the Roman Catholic subjects of the British Crown. The English Jews consented to adopt the English tongue in their synagogues long before other Englishmen could be brought to grant to the English Jews the full rights of citizenship. Does not Mr. Goldwin Smith know that the wonderful career of the most illustrious Englishman of our times would have been impossible to him had not his father abjured the religion of his ancestors ? Benjamin Disraeli was able to enter Parliament in the springtime of his life because he was able to take the oath of allegiance "on the faith of a Christian." How long did the Liberals of the city of London beat in vain at the door of the House of Commons, demanding to be represented there by a great financier and a high-minded English citizen who could not and would not take that oath ?

Mr. Goldwin Smith rebukes the Jews of eastern Europe for adhering to that rite of the circumcision which, as he must assuredly know, is not confined to Jews alone, has prevailed, and prevails, throughout the world from Arabia to Australasia, and from South Africa to Central America, and cannot with any sort of accuracy be called a "tribal" custom. Doubtless Spinoza, who stands alone among philosophers, as does Newton among men of science, or

Pascal among thinkers—doubtless Spinoza was right when he said that the rite of circumcision would maintain the integrity of the Jewish household of faith. The highest medical authorities of our day maintain that it has also kept up the vigor and vitality of the race. I suppose the Protestant Baptists are right in maintaining the rite of immersion as essential to the maintenance of their sect, and the Quakers in maintaining the custom of wearing the hat; but is an American Baptist less trustworthy as an American because he insists upon immersion? Were William Penn and George Fox less trustworthy Englishmen because they wore the hat where others doffed it? Will Mr. Goldwin Smith aver that Sir Moses Montefiore and N. M. de Rothschild were less loyal and patriotic Englishmen, being circumcised children of Israel, than Benjamin Disraeli, who, adopting under his father's roof the religion of the English Church, rose to the highest place among the statesmen of England and of the world as Earl of Beaconsfield?

The most famous and the most popular English writer of fiction of this century, Charles Dickens, was certainly not the less truly an Englishman in his local and national sympathies because he came of a Hebrew family. Would his place in fiction have been other or lower than it is had he adhered to the faith of his ancestors and undergone all the rites of their religion? Is the renown of George Eliot tarnished by her loyalty to the genius of Israel?

Mr. Goldwin Smith must permit me to ask him whether he does justice to his own reputation for candor and for learning when he charges it upon the Jew as a Jew that "he changes his country more easily than others." Are we not at this moment dealing with a "Jewish question" the urgency of which is due to the simple fact that the Jews of Russia and of other countries in eastern Europe cling to the countries in which they have dwelt, and are driven forth from them, not by their own "greed of gain," as Mr. Smith rashly puts it, but by the prejudices of an ignorant peasantry and the policy of autocratic governments? As I have already shown, it is the characteristic of the Jewish race to cling to the soil of the land in which it has been planted. For this reason, in all times and countries the policy of all who hated the Jew has been to forbid him to own or to till the soil. When Portuguese bigotry drove the Jews from the banks of the

Tagus to those of the Garonne, the Jews transplanted to France still called themselves the "Portuguese nation." Under that name they demanded the rights of citizenship from the First Republic in 1791—rights which, by the way, the First Republic would have refused them but for the eloquence and energy of Mirabeau and of Rabaut de St. Etienne.

"When the Southern Confederacy fell," Mr. Goldwin Smith tells us, "its leaders generally stood by the wreck and did their best for those whom they had led, but Judah Benjamin went off to pastures new." Is this sneer an argument to prove the Jewish race incapable of patriotism? Is it worthy of the pen which has indited it? Is it even decently fair to the distinguished lawyer, statesman, and orator at whose grave it is levelled? Surely Mr. Goldwin Smith must know that Judah Benjamin was the companion of Jefferson Davis in that southward hegira from Richmond the true object of which was to raise again, beyond the Mississippi, the fallen banner of the Confederacy. Surely he must know the story of that hegira. Surely he must know how it came to pass that the little band was broken up and scattered. Had not Louisiana, the American home of Judah Benjamin, been made a wilderness for him and for his family long before the fall of the Confederacy? Does not Mr. Goldwin Smith know that Judah Benjamin, born a British subject in Jamaica, and driven from his adopted land at an age when most men would have thought the making of a new career beyond their force, courageously took up the profession of the law in the very metropolis of his mother-country, and there won for himself, by energetic toil, the foremost position at the English bar? "Pastures new!" Nay! Judah Benjamin sought no pastures fat and easy of access! Driven from the home he had made in the new world, he delved in the most difficult of mines, and died overworn with work, though not till his work had been rewarded by a success which reflects honor not on himself alone, but on the Jewish name and race.

I must ask Mr. Goldwin Smith to remember that when Judah Benjamin was born a British subject in Jamaica the English bar was closed to Englishmen of Jewish race. I must ask him to remember that it was only in 1833 that a young Jewish student and gentleman was permitted by English prejudice and proscription to take his place at the English bar; and I must appeal to his candor to admit that the names of Sir Francis Goldsmid, of Sir

George Jessel, of Lord Herschel, and of Judah Benjamin can never be omitted by any historian of the English bar from the roll of honor of English jurisprudence. And before I pass from this point I must, furthermore, protest against the airy assumption that Judah Benjamin alone represented the Jews of America in the dark days of the Civil War. On both sides in that cruel conflict the American Israelites stood shoulder to shoulder with their fellow-citizens of all other races and creeds. The Mordecais, the Cohens, the Levys, the Florences of the South did their duty, as they understood it, to the sovereignties which claimed their immediate allegiance. Had the advice of Mr. Memminger, of South Carolina, an Israelite by race, though not by religion, and a colleague in the Confederate Treasury of Judah Benjamin, been taken at the outset of the conflict, I have been assured the issue of the struggle might have been other than what it actually was; nor have I ever heard that, when the war was ended (happily, as I think) in the victory of the Union, any Southern Israelite who was suffered to remain in his own State failed to "do his best" for his country. On the other side, what soldiers of the Union earned more honor by their loyalty and their valor than Lyon and Rosecrans? What Northern financier was more energetic in support of the national credit than the Belmonts and the Seligmans?

The numbers of the American Jews have always been exaggerated. There is no good ground for believing that they exceeded 100,000 at the outbreak of the Civil War, or less than one-third of 1 per cent. of the total population of the United States in 1860. The rolls of the War Departments of Washington and of Richmond will show what proportion the Jewish soldiers on either side bore to this scanty percentage.

I must leave Mr. Goldwin Smith to reconcile his denunciation of the Jew as a "parasitic" creature who "eats out the core of nationality" with his admission, in another place, that the Jew "always and everywhere" has been "a conforming citizen" who has "refused none of the burdens of the state." To me the statements appear to be absolutely inconsistent one with the other; nor does it much help them that Mr. Goldwin Smith thinks it fair to qualify the admission by adding that the Jew has always made "the burdens of the state" "as light as he could." This may be said with equal truth, I venture to

think, of all men. I have yet to hear of any race or sect of men addicted to demanding habitually the privilege of paying more taxes than their fellow-citizens. But how long is it since the odious "*Leibzoll*," or body-tax, was exacted throughout Germany of every Jew, not once in a year, nor once in a month, but whenever he came into or went out of a city gate, though it might be ten or twenty times a day?

The first real equality of civil rights given to the Jews in Germany came to them with the establishment by Napoleon of the kingdom of Westphalia. At that time the Jews constituted less than one-half of 1 per cent. of the population of Germany,—they constituted no more than 1 per cent. of the population of the empire in 1875,—and such had been the social and political restrictions imposed on them in Germany for ages that no one could have been surprised had they everywhere cast in their lot with the French liberator of their race against their oppressive and intolerant Teutonic fellow-citizens. What actually came to pass when Germany rose against Napoleon after the repulse of the expedition against Russia? The Jews of Germany remembered only that they were Germans. As Germans, they took the field and gave their blood freely for the German Fatherland. But what was their reward? After the crowning victory of the allies in 1815 every German Jew who had won a commission in the armies by his valor and his skill was suddenly deprived of it, and faced the alternative of serving in the ranks or leaving the army altogether! It was in this way that the German rulers of the Holy Alliance set about promoting that amalgamation of the Jews with the rest of their subjects which Mr. Goldwin Smith seems to imagine that nothing has ever prevented but the stiff-necked "tribal" exclusiveness of the children of Israel!

And this took place, observe, years after the Jews, assembled in the great Sanhedrim of Strasburg, had commanded the Jews of France to acquire landed property as a means of training them "to be better Frenchmen," and had ordained that Jews serving in the national armies should be absolved during their term of service from the "ceremonial duties" of their religion!

Is it the opinion of Mr. Goldwin Smith that the object of the Jews who, of their own motion, deliberately established such a decree as this was to "eat out the core of nationality"? If Mr. Goldwin Smith will look into the history and the enact-

ments of the great council of 1807, he will find therein more and more achromatic "light upon the Jewish question" than he has been receiving from the official reports of British vice-consuls charged to report upon the repetition in various regions of eastern Europe of phenomena as old and as familiar as the instincts of prejudice, jealousy, and greed which have produced them.

Of these consular reports Mr. Goldwin Smith makes use, with little or no attempt to examine them critically. He makes long citations, for example, from the reports of Mr. Wagstaff, without telling us that Mr. Wagstaff is established as British vice-consul at Riga, far away from the great centres of the Jewish populations in Russia, and in the midst of a population predominantly German and commercial. In 1840 the Jews were forbidden to dwell in any Livonian city except Riga, and in Riga only 100 Jewish families were permitted to dwell. Mr. Wagstaff is now quoted to prove that a system of "boycotting" exists among the Jews of Bessarabia! This is as if the report of a British vice-consul at Portland, Maine, should be cited in Rome to illustrate the origin of the alleged "massacre" of Italians in New Orleans. Mr. Wagstaff says of the Bessarabian Jews: "They use their religion for business purposes. This is expressed by the words 'koul' or 'kagal.'" This doubtless means the "Kahal" under which the Israelites have stood together in matters affecting their interests from time immemorial. To confound it with the essentially aggressive and tyrannical practice of "boycotting" is to show equal ignorance of the one and of the other. If Mr. Goldwin Smith will consult the decrees of the Sanhedrim of 1807, he will find that in matters of interest and profit the Jews are commanded to treat all their fellow-men as they treat one another. They are forbidden to take usury of any man. They are forbidden to take advantage of any man. They are forbidden even to take interest on loans made for the support of a family. On these and kindred points I am sure every well-informed Jew will agree with me in asking Mr. Goldwin Smith to make the fullest and freest inquiry into what he contemptuously calls the "tribal morality" of the Talmud.

If he will make the inquiry, I venture to say he will no longer talk about the "Karaitic" as purer and loftier than the "Talmudic" morality. Indeed, he seems to imagine, as did the Protestant controversialists of the sixteenth century, that the word "Karaite" stands for Protestant and the word "Talmudic" for

Roman Catholic ; and it may perhaps surprise him to learn that of the three millions of Jews in the Russian Empire, not more certainly than one-third of 1 per cent. belong to the Karaite communities, which exist chiefly in the Crimea. Perhaps his friend, Dr. Sandwith, who seems to have studied the Jewish question chiefly in the Crimea and within the walls of Kars, may have misled him into this curious overestimate, both of the moral elevation and of the importance of the Karaite sectarians. I do not dwell on this, for I have no quarrel with Mr. Goldwin Smith. My only object is to protest against dangerous and bewildering misrepresentations of the "Jewish question," which may do serious mischief at a time when thousands of Jews, expelled from their homes in eastern Europe, are seeking a land of peace and of liberty on this side of the Atlantic. Curiously, the decrees banishing all the Jews of Spain were issued in the very year, 1492, which saw the discovery of America made under the Spanish flag. I do not think the fourth centennial of the expedition of Columbus ought to be celebrated by an organized attempt to exclude the Jews from the new world which he found.

Oddly enough, the cable now announces the outbreak at Elizabethgrad of a local persecution precisely like that which occurred at the same place in 1881. Now, as then, the authorities allow, if they do not inspire, the outbreak, which spares neither Karaite nor Talmudic Jews who have any property worth looting !

The "Jewish question," like other "questions," has many sides. Vice-Consul Wagstaff, studying it at Riga, where the Jews are neither numerous nor very influential, takes it upon hearsay that in regions of Russia where the Jews are both numerous and, through their activity, influential, they exercise a commercial tyranny over the peasantry, earn thereby the hatred of the peasantry, and are thereupon persecuted by the authorities. Doubtless in many parts of agricultural Russia, where the Jews, not being allowed to own land, have been driven out of agriculture into trades and dealing in money, they have behaved no better than other people in similar circumstances have elsewhere behaved. The complaints made of the Jews in Poland, for example, where the vast majority of them live in villages and towns, are almost identical with the complaints made of the "gombeen men" who in Ireland monopolize trade in the rural districts

and control the small farmers by lending or advancing money to them. I have heard complaints of a similar kind made against the "capitalists" of the eastern United States, in the far West.

In Hungary and the Danubian states similar complaints led, a quarter of a century ago, to a "Juden-hitze," or system of "Jew-baiting," as bitter as any now raging. The object of the system then was to drive the Jews into Russia, that other money-lenders and traders might take their places. Long before this, under Nicholas I., the Russian Government set afoot a persecution of the Jews in western Russia and Poland for the purpose of compelling the Jews along the frontier to remove either into Germany or into the interior of the Russian Empire. The famous "deportation ukase" of April, 1844, excited feelings of sympathy and indignation throughout western Europe. Under it hundreds of thousands of Jews were commanded to sell all they had within a very brief period, and leave their homes forever. The ukase led to an earnest remonstrance from the Jews of England, and to the celebrated visit which Sir Moses Montefiore made in the winter of that year to Russia, where he pleaded the cause of Israel personally before the Czar Nicholas, as some years before he had pleaded the cause of the Jews of Damascus and Syria before the Sultan. The main pretext of the persecutions of 1844 and 1881 was that the Jews along the frontier engaged extensively in smuggling, just as the main pretext of the persecution of 1891 is that the Jews in the rural regions engage extensively in trades not always of an elevated kind, and in money-lending not always on the most liberal principles.

In 1844 and 1881, as in 1891, the real motive at the bottom of the persecution is a political motive. It is the desire of the Pan-Slavist leaders and agitators to expel all non-Slavonic elements out of Russia. The Jews are ready and willing to be Russians. They are not, however, Slavs, nor can they be amalgamated into Slavs. In 1844 Nicholas had Jewish soldiers in his guards, and admitted to Sir Moses Montefiore that they were loyal, brave, and excellent soldiers. In 1891 the removal of the Jews is a blow aimed indirectly, but distinctly, at the Germans. Many of the Jews in western Russia are of German origin. Through the "Kahel" all of them may maintain intimate business relations with the Jews of Germany, and by their existence and prosperity as Jews in Russia the German element in Russia, which the Pan-

Slavists are bent on stamping out, is more or less continually reënforced. In 1844 the Czar Nicholas candidly admitted to Sir Moses Montefiore that the accusations levelled at the Russian Jews would not, for the most part, hold water, but he expressed his wish frankly to get them all out of the empire.

In 1891 Germany, which in 1844 was the vassal, has become the rival, of Russia. The policy of Prince Bismarck was to encourage the court chaplain, Stocker, and other German fanatics into a "Jew-baiting" in Germany, which should drive more Jews out of Germany into Russia, and thereby strengthen the subterranean connections between the Russian Empire and central Europe. Since the retirement of Prince Bismarck the Russian Pan-Slavists, who are preparing to Russianize eastern and central Europe in due time, have set on foot a "Jew-baiting" among the Slavonic nations and tribes. They are willing, as were the Russian authorities in 1844, that the Jews should prosper—but not in Russia! In 1844 Count Kisseleff civilly, but cynically, assured Sir Moses Montefiore that he cared not what became of the then existing generation of Jews. "In a century," he said, "the Jews may be educated and good Russians. But I do not care about the Jews now. I only care about the Jews of a century hence!"

Can the Jews of to-day be blamed for caring for themselves? When, in 1561, Cardinal Comendoni went as nuncio from the Pope to King Sigismond, of Poland, he found the Jews of Wilna enjoying equal rights with other Poles. He found them landed proprietors, wearing swords, holding public offices, and he loudly praises—he a Catholic and a cardinal coming from the city of the Ghetto—the system under which the Polish children of Israel were thus enabled to show themselves what their ancestors were in the Holy Land at the time of the Roman Conquest,—tillers of the soil as well as traders, valiant in arms, skilful in the arts, and equal to all the duties of civilization. Even to this day the traces of that better age are visible in the superiority of the Jews of Wilna to their brethren in adjoining circles of the Russian Empire.

When we see what great work the Jews of Europe have done despite the depressing influence of ages of restriction, injustice, and oppression, what may not be hoped from the Jews of America! That the Jew is by nature as well fitted for the du-

ties of a husbandman, or of a sailor, or of a soldier, or of an artisan, as for those of a trader or a money-changer, any Christian may satisfy himself by simply taking a concordance of the Scriptures, old and new, Jewish and Christian, and referring to the occupations therein cited. He will find that the occupations of the Jews when they possessed Palestine were at least as various as the occupations of the English under Elizabeth can be shown to have been by a concordance of Shakespeare. What was the command of the Lord of Hosts to the Jews who were deported from Jerusalem into Babylonia? "Build to yourselves houses, and dwell therein; till your gardens, and eat of the fruit thereof." Have not the Jews of our own day faithfully obeyed this command ever since they found a refuge in New Jersey from those persecutions, "not religious," of 1880 and 1881, in the course of which Professor Röhling, of Prague, was not ashamed to charge Sir Moses Montefiore, then in his ninety-ninth year, with encouraging "the sacrifice of Gentile maidens at the Passover"? Has Mr. Goldwin Smith forgotten that this same atrocious calumny was levelled at the Jews of Damascus by a "consular officer"—not English, indeed, but French—no longer ago than in 1847?

That the Jew is by nature gifted above many other races of men it does not become me to assert. But such is the concurrent testimony of the ages of Christendom, the very existence of Christianity being itself a witness to the assertion. Granting the Jew to be only the equal, intellectually and morally, of other men, what right or reason has any man to affirm of him that by a law of his nature his presence as a citizen, enjoying equal rights with other citizens, in a land of liberty and of plenty, must prove a blight, and not a blessing, to that land and to all its inhabitants, of whatever lineage and of whatever faith?

ISAAC BESHT BENDAVID.